

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 7, 8, 10, 11, and 12 are pending in this application. Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claim 7 has been amended and new claim 12 is added. No new matter is added. Support for new claim 12 can be found at least at page 4, line 1, *et seq.* of the Specification as filed. The amendments to claim 7 have been made to improve the form thereof. In light of the amendments and remarks set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that each of the pending claims is in condition for immediate allowance.

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0158879 (“Broghammer”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0002100 (“Izadpanah”).

Among the limitations of independent claim 7 not present in the cited combination are

audio/video appliances connected to one another in a ring shape by said optical network, wherein data are transmitted between said audio/video appliances in said network in a first data channel configured as a MOST network having a first optical wavelength and in a second data channel configured as an Ethernet having a second optical wavelength, each of said audio/video appliances having an optical coupler with filters for separating said first and second data channels.

The Office Action acknowledges that Broghammer does not explicitly disclose the two channels. In fact, Broghammer merely discloses a standard MOST network. Applicants note that Broghammer also fails to disclose an Ethernet, which is now explicitly recited in claim 1. After noting the former deficiency, the Examiner introduces Izadpanah. However, Izadpanah fails to cure the noted deficiencies in Broghammer.

The Examiner notes that Izadpanah discloses a first portion of the 28 GHz band may be allocated for several narrowband channels with a data bandwidth of up to 6 Mbps. Other portions of the 28 GHz band may be allocated for wider band signals requiring 25 MHz or 51 MHz of bandwidth. A 25 MHz channel can accommodate a data bandwidth of 60-80 Mbps, while a 51 MHz channel can accommodate a data bandwidth of up to 155 Mbps. (Izadpanah at par. [0039]). However, Izadpanah fails to disclose a MOST network and an Ethernet.

Further, we note that in neither the Broghammer reference nor the Izadpanah reference is there any disclosure that the appliances are configured such that they can communicate over both a MOST network and an Ethernet as inherently required by claim 7. Thus, the combination of Broghammer and Izadpanah fails to render claim 7 unpatentable.

Claims 8, 10, and 11 are allowable based at least on their dependence on claim 7.

Applicant has responded to all of the rejections and objections recited in the Office Action. Reconsideration and a Notice of Allowance for all of the pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes an interview would be of assistance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN PONTANI LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By /Alfred W. Froebrich/
Alfred W. Froebrich
Reg. No. 38,887
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

----- Dated: August 25, 2010 -----